

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claim 4 has been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 16, 24, and 29 have been amended. Claims 1-3, and 5-29 are now pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Entry of this Amendment and a timely allowance are respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-14, 16-20, 23, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Barber *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,668). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In regards to independent claim 1, Barber fails to disclose a web server comprising an image store for storing rendered images, wherein the web server is not the computing system from which a user requests an image. The image store feature has been added to claim 1 from cancelled claim 4. The Office Action acknowledged that Barber failed to teach the feature of claim 4 and introduced Tso *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733) to disclose this feature. However, Tso's image store is located within the same client computing system from which the user initiates a request for a hypertext object. Tso's image store is not located in a web server that is separate from the client computing system. Therefore, Barber fails to disclose all features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Regarding independent claims 9, 16, and 29, Barber fails to disclose a requested version of the image being received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a

maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file. Barber is simply silent on the disclosure of this claimed feature. Therefore, Barber fails to teach all features of claims 9, 16, and 29. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejections of these claims and each claim's dependent claims.

Claims 24-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tso *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Regarding independent claim 24, Tso fails to disclose a requested version of the image being received in a format that includes a name of an image file, a maximum width for the requested image, a maximum height for the requested image, a rendering style for the requested image and an extension of the image file. Tso is simply silent on the disclosure of this claimed feature. Therefore, Tso fails to teach all features of claim 24. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 and its dependent claims.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber in view of Tso. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Tso, whether taken alone or in combination with Barber, fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and 16 and also fails to cure the deficiencies of Barber. Therefore, claims 4 and 22, which depend from independent claims 1 and 16 respectively, define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 1 and 16 respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claims 7, 15, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barber in view of Guedalia (U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0135867). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Guedalia, whether taken alone or in combination with Barber, fails to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1, 9, and 16, and also fails to cure the deficiencies of Barber. Therefore, claims 7, 15, and 21, which depend from independent claims 1, 9, and 16 respectively, define over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 1, 9, and 16 respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant has duly considered the rejections of claims 1-3, and 5-29 in the Office Action, and responded by the foregoing claim amendments and remarks. Applicant has thereby distinguished the pending claims from the art of record. Applicant therefore respectfully requests timely entry of this Amendment and passing of this application to issue. Should however any issues remain before issuing this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112 referencing Attorney Docket No. MFCP.103969.

Respectfully submitted,

/Tremayne M. Norris/

Tremayne M. Norris  
Reg. No. 58,683

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Boulevard  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
Phone: (816) 474-6550